

- High School LD Debate
- Interlake Speech and ...
- Closed Group
- Interlake LD
- High School LD Debate
- Catspotting 20+
- Asian-Americans in ... 1
- Husky Puppies Gr... 20+

Shortcuts

See more

Like · Reply · 2h



Paul Zhou Most of the people I've talked to are mainly concerned with the following portion of the rules:
"-If a student is coached by Individual A, they should mark as a conflict all judges representing students coached by Individual A.
- If a judge coaches Competitor A, they should mark as a conflict all individuals with whom Competitor A shares preparation, and all individuals with whom Competitor A shares a coach."

Since private coaching is incredibly prevalent in LD, this rule results in many folks having to conflict huge swaths of the pool. Some judges I've talked to are conflicted with 30+ competitors. One competitor posted a status sharing that she had to conflict over a fourth of the judging pool. I personally had to conflict 10 additional students, most of whom I have never talked to and some of whom I had never even heard of prior to figuring out who I was conflicted from. With the removal of this section I would be pretty content with the conflict rules.

Like · Reply · 2h

5



Greg Malis Prep sharing is a problem. If I am helping debater A, but debater A shares prep with debater B, then I have a conflict with debater B. Seems obvious to me that this is prudent and necessary.

Yes, private coaching is prevalent in LD. We should seek ways to stop it. In the mean time, we need to ensure that the tournament is adjudicated fairly in a world where private coaching is common. Even though you don't know the debaters for which you are conflicted, what would you do if your prep was used in a round in which you judged? That is the problem with prep sharing across team boundaries (or when no team exists).

Like · Reply · 2h · Edited

1



Ryan Hartman **Greg Malis** "private coaching is prevalent in LD we should seek ways to stop it" uh what

does private coaching mean something unusual in this context?

Like · Reply · 2h



Greg Malis Yes, we should stop it. The activity would be much better served if every school had a coach (a school employee) and the backing of the school (like how athletic teams are treated). If there were more school administrators that supported debate, there would be less of a need for private coaching.

Like · Reply · 1h · Edited

2



Kevin Li I feel like if a judge were to hear competitors read evidence that they in some way contributed to, it would not necessarily bias them in terms of how they make a decision. It seems like judging prep that one contributed to is no different from for example a judge having read more books/being more knowledgeable about the literature that debater A is reading than debater B, or if a debater in the round reads a piece of evidence that the judge wrote. The relationship at that point is no longer about the particular debater and the judge, and about prep that might have some connection, but at the point where prep comes from all over the place and people constantly share even across coaching circles, it would be too insignificant to warrant a conflict

Like · Reply · 1h

2



Paul Zhou **Greg Malis** I would be perfectly happy if the rules specified prep-sharing. In their current form they do not. Most of the private coaches I know do not facilitate prep sharing among their students.

I can see a potential problem with positions written by coaches i.e. debater A and debater B share coach C and coach C writes a position for both. If I coached debater A in this situation, I would feel perfectly comfortable judging debater B reading a position that I did not write or help to write. Furthermore, this seems non-unique given the prevalence of taking positions from disclosure pages. Should a debater who takes a case from someones open source have to conflict the coaches of the student from whom the case was taken?

Re: Private coaching should stop. Obviously in an ideal world every student would have access to school coaches. We do not live in that world. Do kids in programs that lack administrative support not deserve quality coaching?

Like · Reply · 1h · Edited

24

High School LD Debate

Closed Group

Shortcuts

See more

I am now conflicting a judge who I once did a single drill with, even though said judge has dropped me twice before. And also keep in mind that with the big coaches, it doesn't matter who their students share prep with. I can guarantee that the coach of some of my "teammates" that is, people I share prep with, is not seeing any of the prep. And so I still have to conflict said person despite the fact that they are entirely impartial.

Like · Reply · 1h

3



Daniel Harris Grant Brown Almost as if that favors larger schools. 🤔🤔🤔🤔🤔🤔🤔

Like · Reply · 1h



Greg Malis Kevin, what I mean by "prep sharing" is far more than just hearing a card that I may have cut. Much of the sharing also includes nuanced strategies, frameworks, etc. If I coached Debater A and contributed significantly to case construction, block writing, 2NR/2AR stories to tell and that debater shared all of that with Debater B, and then I judged Debater B, it would probably be a reasonable source of bias. These things should be avoided.

Paul, I think your examples are interesting. There is no doubt that broad policies in efforts to avoid any conflicts include scenarios that may have not been intended. Perhaps your examples fall into that category. How do we define "prep sharing" in a way that is clear. In the scenario I outlined above, I think that is a case of prep sharing that should lead to a conflict.

In the last example (using an open source case), no. If a debater uses a case that he/she did not write, I think it would be foolish to read that case in front of a coach who may have helped. But to respond to this more directly, I think intent matters. The prep wasn't "shared". I think that requires an overt act of giving prep from one person to another person, not just posting it on a public website.

Like · Reply · 1h



Grant Brown It's great that one of the political motivations of the new rules is explicitly stated now. Namely, that they are built to punish private coaching and those who use it and favor larger institutionally set schools.

Love · Reply · 1h

15



Greg Malis I cannot speak for anyone on the committee other than myself, but I have no problem with the statement that private coaching is not in the long term healthy for the community. If it is a necessary evil, then I will advocate for policies that mirror what I think is a good practice for non-private coaches (such as those who are employed by schools, have a traditional "team", and work as a unit of students who attend the same school. Our activity is best when it is an interscholastic activity. It is the only path to universal access to the activity.

Many here are worried about how rules and expectations that encourage traditional teams and discourage/punish private coaching arrangements are exclusive. Yes, they are. Anything competitive will be exclusive to some degree. Private coaching may actually be more exclusive since every penny must be privately raised/provided. With school-based models, there is a chance that the school may provide support (financial and human resources). We aren't there yet, but it is the direction that we need to go.

My final comment: many of pointed out problems, flaws with how the conflict policy is worded. I presume that you would all agree that conflicts do exist and we should avoid them. So, please write a conflict policy. Don't just point out problems. I have been working on this with my colleagues in policy and LD for over 10-15 years. So, write it out, send it to me via DM, and I will get it to my colleagues on the committee to explore in the future.

Like · Reply · 1h

1



Ryan Hartman Greg Malis "we aren't there yet, but it is the direction that we need to go" i'm sure this helps alleviate the inequalities between schools! onward in that direction!

Love · Reply · 1h

5




Greg Malis Yes, onward in that direction. We should fix inequity in education. I am all for ways to do that. However, as long as debate is competitive, there will be some inequity as there is in football, baseball, and theater. The solution is not to abandon scholastic

Like · Reply · 1h

 **Sai Karavadi** I respect ur opinion, but I find this extremely offensive as someone who started their own LD team at a school with no prior experience or competition in any debate events besides local PF debates, I would've quit LD and debate a long time ago absent private coaching because it was my gateway into a world where I was not only accepted and loved for who I am, but also had the opportunity to succeed presenting myself as such and embracing that, other schools have been in debate for far longer and have the funding and foundation to be highly competitive without requiring students take summer jobs or parents work extra to offer them resources for competitive success in an activity structurally built against them, I am not from a school that cannot fund our debate program but rather from one that does not and would not hire us coaches, I do not mean to attack or call out anyone at all, but I refuse to accept that private coaching is a "necessary evil" because, and I'm not alone in this at all because this is NOT an isolated instance, that's all some kids have

Love · Reply · 1h

29

 **Greg Malis** I think there are a number of great examples of how private coaching has been good for the individual students who have been able to find a private coach and pay for a private coach. You are such an example. You are better for it.


That being said, it is not a viable long-term solution. If the goal is for every high school in the US to have access to a quality debate program, a scholastic model is far more likely to do that than an individual/private coaching model. Thus, I stand by the phrase "necessary evil". It is necessary in a world where the resources are not being spent and schools' priorities are elsewhere (e.g., athletics). However, as a community, we should work towards making it unnecessary.

Like · Reply · 1h

 **Ryan Hartman** **Greg Malis** utopian is probably an understatement for the world you want


Like · Reply · 1h

8

 **Kevin Li** but it seems like in a lot of cases, those in school programs cannot start without students like sai who, as they mentioned, use out of school resources to become involved and knowledgable enough about the debate community to be able to establish in school programs. If people are not given an opportunity to stay in debate, they are not likely to spend time working with their school administration to establish teams and hire school coaching.


Like · Reply · 1h

2

 **Greg Malis** Ryan, in education, we should accept nothing less than Utopian. Pay teachers salaries that are competitive with other professions for which bachelor's degrees and graduate degrees are required. Yup. Schools should be palaces and teachers and support staff should be paid like royalty. It is what I want. Guilty as charged.


Like · Reply · 1h

1

 **Kevin Li** also, out of school private coaching, in many cases, stem not just from people not having access to school coaching, but because relationships are built with people on the circuit who have faced similar experiences and forms of exclusion in the community, and many coaches act as mentors and adults that debaters feel more safe around than administration-established coaches at their schools. Given that many students do debate for different reasons other than competitive success, it is hard to find a school coach who can help all the students from that school navigate the community in the same way that private, organically formed coaching relationships can.

Like · Reply · 1h

2

 **SunHee Simon-Mbong** I'm just going to join this conversation really quickly. I probably won't comment anymore more but I am more than happy to talk about the way that I'm feeling about the issue over private message. A lot of the talk that I've been seeing today has been giving me a lot of feelings. And I know in competitive debate it seems like there aren't a lot of time for feelings. But at the end of the day that's what everyone is doing right now. we can type out of constructive argument all we want on a Facebook thread

High School LD Debate

Closed Group

Shortcuts

See more

Honestly Greg seeing your comment really hurt me. It made me think about the ways in which private coaching has made it possible for me to live on an expensive campus like Stanford as a low income first gen student and how it provides me a future especially when programs refuse to pay me properly or prevent me from attending tournaments that I wish I could attend. I think about the way parents respected me more than program directors ever did.

I also think about a lot of the udl students I've tried to work with and how fruitless those efforts were because coaching was short and money was low and how private coaching probably could have resolved a lot of the issues they were facing.

I'm also thinking about the ways in which private coaching has definitely been hijacked by the elite. But the private coaching that students at private schools get seem to be just as inequitable.

I will not be attending the TOC this weekend because I've continuously been reminded that it is not a place for me or people like me. I'm not surprised that a lot of people are expressing disdain at this new conflict policy either. Yet I'm still wondering why we continue to fight to be a part of an institution that cares for the minority.

I'm also shocked to see a committee director explicitly say that private coaching should be ended in this activity while not simultaneously also talking about ways in which large schools can help promote the school-based solutions that you talked about and I'm sure many of your colleagues have as well.

It's also strange to see age and experience used as a way to dismiss future coaches and future Educators in this activity. 10 to 15 years is a long time and I respect that deeply. But it seems like all the times that I brought similar issues up to my older colleagues that reference has been used to belittle my concerns and not engage in them.

If constructive dialogue is going to develop and the TOC committee and other large schools in this community are actually concerned with promoting equity in Lincoln Douglas specifically. I'd suggest having an open forum and actually talking to the young coaches who are on the ground helping independent students period when decisions are made behind closed doors and announced after the fact, anger will follow and no constructive alternative will Fester from it.

I also apologize for typos since I'm doing this on my phone. Best of luck to all this weekend and I hope if anything the experience will provide a basis for reflection and growth.

Like · Reply · 58m · Edited 27



Paul Zhou My revision to the section I take issue with would be as follows:

"-If student A shares preparation with student B, student A should mark as a conflict all judges representing students B.

-If a judge coaches Competitor A, they should mark as a conflict all individuals with whom Competitor A shares preparation."

I am posting it publicly rather than DMing you because I think that transparency is good and that rules that affect the community at large should be able to be discussed openly by said community.

We seem to agree that the primary concern is with prep-sharing, since I have yet to see a reason why students sharing a coach is grounds for a conflict absent prep-sharing. Thus, my solution is to remove the shared coaching criterion from the equation. As explained prior, this specific standard is what produces the overwhelming majority of the "scenarios that may have not been intended."

Sure, the problem of defining prep-sharing remains. I don't think this problem is sufficient reason to prevent revision of the rules.

First, the rules currently reference prep-sharing without further explanation. If the lack of a definition makes it a useless criterion then why include it in the first place?

Second, conflict rules will always be insufficiently defined. The rules reference concepts like romantic relationships and relatives without defining them. Is a mutual crush a romantic relationship? Is my third cousin twice removed a relative? Aren't all humans technically biologically related to some extent? Obviously these examples are absurd attempts to stretch these concepts to their limit, but the point remains that an exhaustive definition is seen as unnecessary for the rest of the conflict rules. For every other conflict rule, there is a level of trust afforded to competitors that they will interpret the rules in good faith. Why should a prep-

High School LD Debate

Closed Group

Shortcuts

See more

coaching as a proxy is a terrible solution, since the vast majority of private coaches do not facilitate prep sharing and many instances of prep sharing occur outside the context of a shared coach. Using shared coaching as a proxy seems about as effective as using something like geographic location. It may capture some instances of prep-sharing, but it would miss many others and create a ridiculous number of needless conflicts in the process.

Like · Reply · 1h

9



Daniel Harris Greg, I'm glad you have such strong ideals, but you should perhaps consider grounding them in reality. This policy screws over smaller and less fortunate debaters who don't go to huge high schools that are either private and expensive or have massive team dues. And Sai is absolutely correct not only for that specific point but the larger point. If you try to suffocate private coaching, you prevent hundreds of students from entering the debate community. And if accessibility is not one of your fundamental values, you do not belong in the TOC board. It is absurd to suggest that no one should be coaching if they are not a professional employed educator because if that were the case, LD would have far too few coaches.

But all that aside, the most important point is that you do not have the jurisdiction to make this massive and clearly controversial choice on our behalf. Your responsibility is to fairly create and execute the rules. If you feel that you have the power of a legislative body, then there needs to be a larger discussion about the disproportionate power large schools have in this process and how little input the larger community is given.

Love · Reply · 54m · Edited

10



Greg Malis Daniel, at no point did I say that only those who are professional educators should be coaches. I would love to see a model where EVERY school has at least one professional educator on campus as the head coach/director. That coach could hire an appropriate number of assistant coaches, many of which could be college-age who are paid by the school but not teachers at the school. Yes, more Utopian ideas, but I would like to see this be the model at EVERY school. Thus, the "private coaches" we are describing would be assistant coaches while in college or starting in a non-educational field. They are involved. They are invaluable to their students, but the scholastic model is intact and expanded.

Regarding the "jurisdiction" question, the Advisory Committee is not a legislative body, and we make no rules. We propose policies that we think are better for this particular tournament. The TOC tournament director (Dave Arnett) has sole jurisdiction over this tournament. He adopts our recommendations if he agrees with them. He modifies them if he wants to change them. He rejects them if he doesn't like them. We have no illusions of grandeur. The TOC is not governed by an organization (unlike NDCA, NCFL, NSDA, or virtually every state championship tournament). It's one person's party.

Like · Reply · 49m



Daniel Harris Yet this still favors wealthy private schools where they can hire massive coaching staff. At some level, you are excluding new students whose schools do not have an established program, and you are helping schools with more money. And I fail to see how your point about Dave is relevant. Either all of you have no reason to exist in your position in the Committee, or you are complicit in an undemocratic and easily corrupted system.

Like · Reply · 41m · Edited

6



Greg Malis Daniel, there is no "system". The TOC is not an organization, any more than a single invitational is an organization. It has a tournament director. He gets to make the rules. He seeks input from coaches. He chooses the coaches from which he seeks input. Never claimed that there was any democratic process to it. However, it certainly is not corrupt.

Yes, a scholastic model that I endorse favors wealthy schools. So does football, baseball, chess, quiz bowl, and anything else that is competitive. Private coaching also favors wealthy FAMILIES who can afford it. Summer debate camps for kids at schools with teams and for kids at schools without teams is also expensive and exclusive. I don't have an answer to that.

Like · Reply · 38m



Write a reply...

Privacy · Terms · Advertising · Cookies · More
Facebook © 2018

Search

High School LD Debate

Closed Group

Shortcuts

[See more](#)

exclusive. Most of us don't have the luxury of being Harvard Westlake or Greenhill debaters, and our school districts prioritize things like sports over debate. There's not really a way to get around obstacles like that. Additionally, in certain regions, circuit debate isn't prominent, and it's difficult for debaters in those areas to find "established school coaching." Thus, the ONLY coaching smaller school debaters have easy access to is private coaching. Many private coaches also offer to work pro bono for debaters who cannot afford coaching. Private coaching also allows debaters to expand their argument styles and increases the diversity of thought on the circuit, which is probably a good thing, since debate's supposed to be an educational activity. I agree with Sai -- if it wasn't for my private coaches, I would have quit debate long ago; and I'm sure as prominent educators in the community, the last thing the TOC wants is to discourage small school debaters from debating.

[Love](#) · [Reply](#) · 1h

19

[Hide 18 Replies](#)



Megan Wu seconded! i would not be a circuit debater (nor a debater at all!) without the private coach i've been lucky to have.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1h

5



Greg Malis The solution is simple, but people reading this aren't going to like it. Private coaches should stop being private coaches. They should commit to being professional educators. Get certified to teach. Get a degree in a field that makes you employable as educators. If people are committed to the activity and think coaching it is valuable, then coach it as a career. There are enough alumni of the "national circuit" to be head coaches or assistant coaches to cover every high school in the US. That is what I would like to see.

[Haha](#) · [Reply](#) · 1h · Edited

9



Greg Malis What is so funny about a career debate coach wanting his students to become career debate coaches? Give back to the community that gave you much. Make a career out of it.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1h

1



Ansuman Bardalai yeah tbh i agree with greg: raam and jerry should've waiting another couple years for hemanth to graduate from harvard and get a teaching credential before coaching for pen at the 2016-2017 toc

[Haha](#) · [Reply](#) · 1h · Edited

7



Varad Agarwala **Greg Malis** I respect a lot of what you have to say and know you are an incredibly intelligent person. But your solution is... absurd to say the least. I don't want to teach debate as a career. I still want to be involved. Obviously that is good as a model, because if you create a forced choice you will lose nearly half of the judging pool at every major tournament in the country.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1h

16



Greg Malis Ansuman, you are using too narrow of an arc in time. If enough debate alumni who have the progressive approach to debate that many in this group would want decided to be career coaches AND schools without programs were willing to start them, the need for private coaching would end. My only argument is I think that would be better than what we have now. Is it realistic? Nope. Is it going to happen? Nope (especially when the immediate reaction after I made the suggestion was to laugh and not acknowledge that I am right).

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1h



Greg Malis **Varad Agarwala**, my solution is only absurd because it isn't practical and has 0% chance of happening. However, it still is the way to go. I am proud to have graduated from what can be described as the greatest policy debate program in the history of the US. Do you want to know how many alumni of my debate program became career debate coaches? I can count them on one hand. That is sad. We must do better getting our alumni to want to be career debate coaches. I love it when my math students want to teach math. I am proud that I have a good number of those. I want some of my debaters to be career coaches as well. No shame in that as absurd as you and others may find it.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1h

1



Varad Agarwala Honestly Malis if we are in agreement that this has a 0% chance of happening and isn't practical... I honestly have no clue on earth how you think it is "still the way to go." Truly, genuinely do not.

21

[Privacy](#) · [Terms](#) · [Advertisi](#)
[Cookies](#) · [More](#)
Facebook © 2018


Search

High School LD Debate

Closed Group

Shortcuts

See more

- 


Greg Malis

Simple philosophy that I have: right the right worth fighting, not just the ones I can win.

Like

Reply

1h


1
- 

Ryan Hartman

Greg Malis and denounce coaches providing assistance to students who wouldnt receive it otherwise while doing so!

Like

Reply

1h
- 


Ansuman Bardalai

Greg Malis sounds like resentment to me

Like

Reply

1h


1
- 

Greg Malis

Didn't denounce any private coach. I am denouncing the practice because I don't think it is healthy in the long term for the activity writ large. Individual private coaches have done great things for the kids they have worked with. I applaud those coaches and those kids. I can dislike a practice while liking and respecting the individuals who are engaged in that practice. I can want to end a particular practice while liking and respecting the individual who are engaging in a practice that I hope to see as unnecessary some day before I did.

Like

Reply

58m
- 


Ryan Hartman

i'll rephrase - denounce a practice that provides assistance to students who wouldnt receive it otherwise while doing so

Like

Reply

57m

1
- 


Kevin Li

even if private coaching should be ended, creating rules to chase out debaters who use those practices does not solve the issue. It puts people in a position where, rather than people incentivized to build school programs, they will simply leave the activity because they have no way of competing. there are active ways to help kids talk to administration and build school programs, and excluding them from competitive success at the TOC is not one of them

Like

Reply

52m

8
- 


Greg Malis

Ryan, yes, I am denouncing a practice that despite its upside in the short term (as long as schools continue not to adequately fund and support quality debate), I think is outweighed by the downside. It is as simple as that. My model is unrealistic. The private coaching model is a good solution for the long haul is also unrealistic. So, yes, I will denounce a practice that I think is a net negative for the ACTIVITY as a whole, even if it is a net positive for individual debaters and individual coaches who have made a mutually beneficial agreement. There is nothing more than I can say.

Like

Reply

43m

1
- 


Logan Reed

There's literally no downside. Independent coaches and debaters aren't why inequality in funding exists. It's because of like, idk, inequality in society in general? You are blaming people with less resources for the fact that disparities exists which is backward and frankly offensive

Love

Reply

37m

11
- 

Ansuman Bardalai


"So, yes, I will denounce a practice that I think is a net negative for the ACTIVITY as a whole, even if it is a net positive for individual debaters and individual coaches who have made a mutually beneficial agreement. There is nothing more than I can say."

"this may be good for small schools but not for massive rich schools so its bad"

Like

Reply

34m

3
- 

Katherine Guo

Even in a "big school", private coaching is often necessary. If a team is mainly PF-oriented, almost all funding goes to that division, leaving LD incredibly under-funded and susceptible to having coaches bought out by larger schools. It's incredibly difficult to find a single coach that actively debated every form of LD without having to pay tens of thousands annually. Furthermore, with the way that many public schools are already underfunded, it would be impossible to hire even a single head coach for many public/smaller schools.

Like

Reply

21m

1



Write a reply...

Everyone has come to the agreement that it will never happen. It just seems to benefit programs that already have in-house coaches, and leave debaters who are coached privately at a disadvantage.

Love · Reply · 58m · Edited

15



Jasper Primack Setting aside the conflict policy - Mr. Malis, your desire for more institutional coaching is admirable but I am not sure how deterring private coaching leads LD towards that end.

1. Deterring private coaching will not lead students and parents to push for institutional coaches. As many above have explained, private coaching often benefits those who debate at schools that have not and would not hire institutional coaches, for a variety of reasons. Consequently, deterring private coaches simply means that those students will be less able to participate in the activity.

2. Deterring private coaching will not lead FYOs and college coaches to become institutional coaches. As Varad pointed out, rarely do college students who debated in high school consider becoming lifelong coaches. If the TOC and other tournaments make it slightly less easy for those students to coach and judge, then the most likely result will be fewer of those students coaching and judging, rather than re-orienting their career plans to become institutional coaches.

Perhaps private coaching won't achieve the equitable debate environment that we all want. But don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Like · Reply · 40m

4



Greg Malis Regardless of whether deterring private coaching will spur institutional coaching, there are some unique issues associated with private coaching - namely accountability and safety. Debater A is a 17 year old kid whose family has contracted with a 20 year old coach. Debater A engages in behavior that is unsafe. I would like to contact a school official since the student should be representing a school. Whom do I contact? A school admin isn't going to accept responsibility since the kid is competing independently from the school. If I go to the coach, how do I have any assurance that the coach (who is not an employee of the school) will do anything about it? What if the coach engages in conduct that is harmful, what do I as a tournament director do?

Much of these arguments are focused on education and access. I am being mocked for a Utopian view of school-based model. The idea that private coaching can even come close to filling the gap is also Utopian. So, let's focus on the reality. We have a problem in our community where debaters do things and say things that make the debate space unsafe. Coaches do that, too. However, in a scholastic model, there is a third party that can do something to hold people accountable. School administrators can punish students and coaches for their behavior at tournaments. Is that enough, despite its seeming low probability, for me to want to deter private coaching? Yes. First, it has a higher probability than most people think. Second, go ask a school administrator about hosting a tournament where there are kids competing where the chaperone is not the legal guardian/parent of that kid, is not a school employee, and quite possibly does not have the background that a school's insurance policy may require. These risks are real. The harms are real. They happen almost every weekend at national circuit tournaments. It's just not something that is well publicized.

Like · Reply · 26m

1



Logan Reed What does chaperones and logistical concerns at invitationals have to do with private coaches? I've been a coach all year, my job isn't to be liable for the kids I coach at tournaments but to educate them about debate. I'm often not physically present when they are debating and nobody claims any form of liability. You aren't speaking to the issue at hand because you seem to rather want to criticize the existence of debaters not from institutional programs in debate

Like · Reply · 20m



Logan Reed I fundamentally disagree with the premise that only debaters with a school-hired coach should be able to participate in debate, but regardless, that debate is separate from the debate about if private coaches are detrimental to the activity. If you wanna flame independents (for fun? Because you have institutional power, not them) make another thread

Like · Reply · 15m · Edited

guardian who has medical info/insurance info present and ask for 1. letters from school admin. confirming that the guardian will be responsible 2. liability forms and waivers that must be signed. That's just from my experience talking to my school's administration and independent debaters.

Like · Reply · 14m

1



Greg Malis Logan and Katherine, there are large number of tournaments where the private coach is the one who is listed as the contact. It is often the private coach that does the registration, and perhaps a parent is there because the tournament requires it. Yet, it is the private coach that is the face of the program. That isn't not how tournament rules are designed, but it is often how it plays out. The idea of private coaching and independent entries are inextricably linked. From a logistical standpoint, they often have to be treated similarly, even if they are not identical.

Logan, although this particular response is not directly speaking to the issue, I have plenty of other responses in the last hour or two that do, so I am ok if this one didn't. So, yes, we have a fundamental disagreement. I think every debater should have a school-hired coach. The ones that would otherwise be private coaches could be assistant coaches that are paid by the school, rather than families. Both models are exclusive and advantage those with more resources. There is no solution to that. So, I will advocate for a school-based system because it is the only long-term, sustainable system that could get debaters in every high school in the US (even if it won't actually occur).

Like · Reply · 3m



Write a reply...

Someone is typing a comment...



Write a comment...